

THE SALT LAKE DAILY HERALD.

VOL. X.

SALT LAKE CITY, WEDNESDAY MORNING, MARCH 24, 1880.

NO. 247.

JUST RECEIVED,
CALIFORNIA BUTTER,
HOUSEHOLD TINWARE,
WOODEN WARE AND
WILLOW WARE,
Fancy and Plain
Lunch
Buckets.
TEA, WAFFLES & COFFEES
SPECIALTY
CANNED
GOODS
DELIVERED PROMPTLY.

SALT LAKE FOUNDRY AND MACHINE CO.
Works—One and a half blocks south of U. C. R. R. Depot.
Having a well-appointed Foundry, Machine and Boiler Shops, we are now prepared to furnish Steam Engines, Boilers, Steam Mills, Mining, Milling and Hoisting Machinery, Smelting Furnaces, Water Jacket, Slat Pits, etc. Saw and Grind Mills, Shafting and Pulleys, all kinds of rollers, Tanks and Plate Work made to order. Boilers and Steam Engines tested.
Copper Work for Breweries, Distilleries, etc., etc.
FOR SALE
One 20-horse-power Stationary Engine. \$1250
One 15 do. do. do. 800
One 10 do. do. do. 500
One 17-inch Turbine Wheel. 100
Two Steam Pumps for Boiler Feed. 100
P. O. BOX 1139.

1880. 1880.
FRUIT
RAISINS, CURRANTS, CITRUS AND LEMON
PEEL, CANDIES, NUTS, Etc.,
At TEASDEL'S.
PRICES, AS USUAL, ARE THE VERY LOWEST.
DRY GOODS.
FULL SUPPLY OF SHAWLS, HOODS, SCARFS
'BOOTS AND SHOES.
EVERY VARIETY, STYLE AND CLASS, BOUGHT
BEFORE THE RECENT ADVANCE, AND WILL
BE SOLD AT SATISFACTORY PRICES.
CLOTHING.
MEN'S AND BOYS' A FULL STOCK. ALSO
HATS, CAPS, BLANKETS.
A VISIT TO THIS IMMENSE STOCK WILL
AMPLY REPAIR PURCHASERS.
STOVES.
ANOTHER CAR LOAD ARRIVED OF COOK-
ING AND HEATING STOVES,
At TEASDEL'S.

SEARS & LIDDLE,
Wholesale and Retail dealers in
GRAIN, FLOUR, FEED
Grass, Garden and Field Seeds,
EARLY AMBER SUGAR CANE SEED,
East Temple street,
THREE DOORS SOUTH OF Z. C. M. I., SALT LAKE CITY
AND PARK CITY.

JOHN TAYLOR & SON,
MERCHANT TAILORS.
Have now on hand a full line of
SEASONABLE CLOTHS AND SUITINGS
To be disposed of at reasonable figures to make place for their new stock of
SPRING AND SUMMER GOODS
Which are expected in a few days, and will embrace
English, French, Scotch and American Suit-
ings, Coatings, Trousers, &c., of
New and Elegant Styles.

CEO. SAVILLE,
Ladies' and Gentlemen's
FASHIONABLE BOOT AND SHOE MAKER
Second South Street, Three Doors East of Elephant Corner.
Repairing done on short notice. Your patronage respectfully solicited.

G. F. CULMER
Has the Largest Stock of
WINDOW GLASS
In the Territory. Manufactures all sizes and shapes of
SHOW CASES.
An immense saving by buying them of
C. F. CULMER, TEA POT STORE.
50 & 52 First South Street.

THE CANAL.
Judge Snow Gives More Facts
and Figures on the
Subject.
SALT LAKE CITY, March 22, 1880.
Editors Herald:
On looking over my remarks in the Herald of the 21st, I discovered I have not, in a few places, made myself as clearly understood as I ought. So I am guilty of leaving undone some things which I ought to have done. In that letter I find the following: "It is not a recognized principle of law, and a recognized right to the use of water may be acquired by appropriation and lost by abandonment." I was speaking in general terms. My mind was on the Utah Lake and the Jordan, the outlet to that lake. The waters of this lake are common property, and no one can have an exclusive right thereto. These waters are common to all. Not that a part may not be appropriated to one and a part to another's use, as the waters come to, lie in and flow from the common fountain. I intended to say that all have a common right to appropriate the water to a reasonable extent for a reasonable purpose, but in its very nature is not so easily segregated as land is, complications necessarily arise.
Again, I find myself to have said near the close of my letter "that right, as far as the town is concerned." I ought to have said "that it then would have read 'so far as this town is concerned.'" There is something in leaving the mind to reflect, or, at least, it appears to me, purposely computed the tax on the taxable property of the city at \$5 per \$1,000, as that would pay the interest. It would raise \$21,000 per annum, which was the interest on \$250,000, at 8 per cent. per annum, and \$1,000 for collecting and disbursing.
In another part of the letter I supposed—stating I did not know—that the revenue of the city might be \$150,000 per annum, and if so, one-tenth of that would be \$15,000. Now this \$30,000 will be a little in excess of \$1 per \$1,000, while \$21,000 will be what I wrote.
The city charter provides many resources for city revenue, among them being a tax on the city property, a little in excess of eleven mills on the dollar. This, if exercised to its fullest extent, will be \$77,000 per annum, though I am told they do not generally exceed five mills. Five mills only amounts to one per cent. on round numbers, \$55,000. The balance of the revenue is from license. The liquor dealers constitute a part. I will make a little computation of this last sum in connection with our present tax law. The property of the taxpayer outside of the city, including territorial, school and county, \$12 on the \$1,000; but with this the city tax on the taxable property in the city of Salt Lake, on the dollar, and it makes \$17 per \$1,000. If we add to this a water tax of \$4 per \$1,000, it will make \$21 on the \$1,000 for territorial, county, school, city and water tax, without increasing the tax to raise the \$50 per annum, no persons taxes will be increased by the borrowing.
Now to the benefit I have before said we must have water and land to grow crops, and we can depend on rain. Whatever may be said about God's sending rain on the just and on the unjust, neither the just nor the unjust in this country get as much water as they need. If they asked for it they would get it. They do not get it. They now seek it pursuant to scientific rules.
Assuming for the present, that no prior rights exist to prevent us from appropriating these waters to our use, what benefit is to be derived from our doing it, in whole or in part?
This leads me to the canal, which I am told is to be a little more than twenty-five miles in length, extending from the Jordan to the eastern part of the city, to be of sufficient width and depth to contain a large volume of water. Whether this can be done or not over land that we all know is porous is a question for the engineers. I am not sufficiently well versed in that class of business to enable me to form an opinion. Still, on general principles, we all know, myself among the number, that water in porous land percolates through the soil, and in all lands that the sun sends forth light upon it evaporates. If the canal can be built, and I am told it can, so as to prevent percolation of the water, well, that is a good thing. It will be a good thing, and I know, in sufficient quantities to raise crops; so good may thereby grow out of it. But suppose this to be an error, is there any good to be got of it by irrigation? I am not a farmer, but I am a citizen. I know that the quantity of water which evaporates at any given period from the square foot or square yard of surface, yet it is quite considerable, very likely enough to be a question for the engineers. 10,000,000 solid feet of water may pass into vapor. But where will this vapor go? Scientists tell us that vapor ascends in the air till it reaches an atmosphere of equal heat and pressure, and then, if the air is cool, returns to water and the water returns to the land. Take this statement as correct and apply a little intuition to it and what then? This canal is southeast of the city. The mountains east of it, covered with snow nearly every year till August, will, it appears to me, have a tendency to attract the vapor, cool it off, condense it, and return it in the shape of rain, but this is only auxiliary to the main benefit, yet it is something. The main benefit is to be realized by the inhabitants of the city. Suppose that the money is borrowed and laid out on the canal. This requires a large sum of money. Men who are engaged in business, would not get work and employment, get their pay, the money is paid them, and the city now has the canal, but it is no richer than it was before. It has the canal, but it owes for the canal, and the city is poorer. If the canal can be good the city is neither the richer nor the poorer by the operation. The question now is can the inhabitants of the city get means enough out of the water of the canal to pay themselves for the labor, and pay themselves annually \$30,000, that being the sum to be annually paid for the fifteen years, if so the money is well borrowed, but if not it is getting it here we have injured no person. I will suppose the water here in reasonable quantities, what then? It is known to us that Utah Lake, the natural source of supply, holds in solution vegetable decomposition. It is further known that water running in a warm country is

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION
(Postage Paid.)
Salt Lake Daily Herald:
One Year, \$10.00
Six Months, 5.00
Three Months, 2.50
Salt Lake Semi-Weekly Herald:
One Year, \$3.00
Six Months, 1.75
Salt Lake Weekly Herald:
One Year, \$2.00
Six Months, 1.25
Send Money in Registered Letter or Postoffice Order.
Address
THE HERALD,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Gentle Women
Who want glossy, luxuriant and wavy tresses of abundant, beautiful hair must use **LYON'S KATHAIRON**. This elegant, cheap article always makes the hair grow freely and fast, keeps it from falling out, arrests and cures grayness, removes dandruff and itching, makes the hair strong, giving it a curling tendency and keeping it in any desired position. Beautiful, healthy hair is the sure result of using Kathairon.

THE PEOPLE'S PAPER.
—THE—
HERALD.
SALT LAKE DAILY HERALD.

THE CANAL.
Judge Snow Gives More Facts
and Figures on the
Subject.
SALT LAKE CITY, March 22, 1880.
Editors Herald:
On looking over my remarks in the Herald of the 21st, I discovered I have not, in a few places, made myself as clearly understood as I ought. So I am guilty of leaving undone some things which I ought to have done. In that letter I find the following: "It is not a recognized principle of law, and a recognized right to the use of water may be acquired by appropriation and lost by abandonment." I was speaking in general terms. My mind was on the Utah Lake and the Jordan, the outlet to that lake. The waters of this lake are common property, and no one can have an exclusive right thereto. These waters are common to all. Not that a part may not be appropriated to one and a part to another's use, as the waters come to, lie in and flow from the common fountain. I intended to say that all have a common right to appropriate the water to a reasonable extent for a reasonable purpose, but in its very nature is not so easily segregated as land is, complications necessarily arise.
Again, I find myself to have said near the close of my letter "that right, as far as the town is concerned." I ought to have said "that it then would have read 'so far as this town is concerned.'" There is something in leaving the mind to reflect, or, at least, it appears to me, purposely computed the tax on the taxable property of the city at \$5 per \$1,000, as that would pay the interest. It would raise \$21,000 per annum, which was the interest on \$250,000, at 8 per cent. per annum, and \$1,000 for collecting and disbursing.
In another part of the letter I supposed—stating I did not know—that the revenue of the city might be \$150,000 per annum, and if so, one-tenth of that would be \$15,000. Now this \$30,000 will be a little in excess of \$1 per \$1,000, while \$21,000 will be what I wrote.
The city charter provides many resources for city revenue, among them being a tax on the city property, a little in excess of eleven mills on the dollar. This, if exercised to its fullest extent, will be \$77,000 per annum, though I am told they do not generally exceed five mills. Five mills only amounts to one per cent. on round numbers, \$55,000. The balance of the revenue is from license. The liquor dealers constitute a part. I will make a little computation of this last sum in connection with our present tax law. The property of the taxpayer outside of the city, including territorial, school and county, \$12 on the \$1,000; but with this the city tax on the taxable property in the city of Salt Lake, on the dollar, and it makes \$17 per \$1,000. If we add to this a water tax of \$4 per \$1,000, it will make \$21 on the \$1,000 for territorial, county, school, city and water tax, without increasing the tax to raise the \$50 per annum, no persons taxes will be increased by the borrowing.
Now to the benefit I have before said we must have water and land to grow crops, and we can depend on rain. Whatever may be said about God's sending rain on the just and on the unjust, neither the just nor the unjust in this country get as much water as they need. If they asked for it they would get it. They do not get it. They now seek it pursuant to scientific rules.
Assuming for the present, that no prior rights exist to prevent us from appropriating these waters to our use, what benefit is to be derived from our doing it, in whole or in part?
This leads me to the canal, which I am told is to be a little more than twenty-five miles in length, extending from the Jordan to the eastern part of the city, to be of sufficient width and depth to contain a large volume of water. Whether this can be done or not over land that we all know is porous is a question for the engineers. I am not sufficiently well versed in that class of business to enable me to form an opinion. Still, on general principles, we all know, myself among the number, that water in porous land percolates through the soil, and in all lands that the sun sends forth light upon it evaporates. If the canal can be built, and I am told it can, so as to prevent percolation of the water, well, that is a good thing. It will be a good thing, and I know, in sufficient quantities to raise crops; so good may thereby grow out of it. But suppose this to be an error, is there any good to be got of it by irrigation? I am not a farmer, but I am a citizen. I know that the quantity of water which evaporates at any given period from the square foot or square yard of surface, yet it is quite considerable, very likely enough to be a question for the engineers. 10,000,000 solid feet of water may pass into vapor. But where will this vapor go? Scientists tell us that vapor ascends in the air till it reaches an atmosphere of equal heat and pressure, and then, if the air is cool, returns to water and the water returns to the land. Take this statement as correct and apply a little intuition to it and what then? This canal is southeast of the city. The mountains east of it, covered with snow nearly every year till August, will, it appears to me, have a tendency to attract the vapor, cool it off, condense it, and return it in the shape of rain, but this is only auxiliary to the main benefit, yet it is something. The main benefit is to be realized by the inhabitants of the city. Suppose that the money is borrowed and laid out on the canal. This requires a large sum of money. Men who are engaged in business, would not get work and employment, get their pay, the money is paid them, and the city now has the canal, but it is no richer than it was before. It has the canal, but it owes for the canal, and the city is poorer. If the canal can be good the city is neither the richer nor the poorer by the operation. The question now is can the inhabitants of the city get means enough out of the water of the canal to pay themselves for the labor, and pay themselves annually \$30,000, that being the sum to be annually paid for the fifteen years, if so the money is well borrowed, but if not it is getting it here we have injured no person. I will suppose the water here in reasonable quantities, what then? It is known to us that Utah Lake, the natural source of supply, holds in solution vegetable decomposition. It is further known that water running in a warm country is

THE CANAL.
Judge Snow Gives More Facts
and Figures on the
Subject.
SALT LAKE CITY, March 22, 1880.
Editors Herald:
On looking over my remarks in the Herald of the 21st, I discovered I have not, in a few places, made myself as clearly understood as I ought. So I am guilty of leaving undone some things which I ought to have done. In that letter I find the following: "It is not a recognized principle of law, and a recognized right to the use of water may be acquired by appropriation and lost by abandonment." I was speaking in general terms. My mind was on the Utah Lake and the Jordan, the outlet to that lake. The waters of this lake are common property, and no one can have an exclusive right thereto. These waters are common to all. Not that a part may not be appropriated to one and a part to another's use, as the waters come to, lie in and flow from the common fountain. I intended to say that all have a common right to appropriate the water to a reasonable extent for a reasonable purpose, but in its very nature is not so easily segregated as land is, complications necessarily arise.
Again, I find myself to have said near the close of my letter "that right, as far as the town is concerned." I ought to have said "that it then would have read 'so far as this town is concerned.'" There is something in leaving the mind to reflect, or, at least, it appears to me, purposely computed the tax on the taxable property of the city at \$5 per \$1,000, as that would pay the interest. It would raise \$21,000 per annum, which was the interest on \$250,000, at 8 per cent. per annum, and \$1,000 for collecting and disbursing.
In another part of the letter I supposed—stating I did not know—that the revenue of the city might be \$150,000 per annum, and if so, one-tenth of that would be \$15,000. Now this \$30,000 will be a little in excess of \$1 per \$1,000, while \$21,000 will be what I wrote.
The city charter provides many resources for city revenue, among them being a tax on the city property, a little in excess of eleven mills on the dollar. This, if exercised to its fullest extent, will be \$77,000 per annum, though I am told they do not generally exceed five mills. Five mills only amounts to one per cent. on round numbers, \$55,000. The balance of the revenue is from license. The liquor dealers constitute a part. I will make a little computation of this last sum in connection with our present tax law. The property of the taxpayer outside of the city, including territorial, school and county, \$12 on the \$1,000; but with this the city tax on the taxable property in the city of Salt Lake, on the dollar, and it makes \$17 per \$1,000. If we add to this a water tax of \$4 per \$1,000, it will make \$21 on the \$1,000 for territorial, county, school, city and water tax, without increasing the tax to raise the \$50 per annum, no persons taxes will be increased by the borrowing.
Now to the benefit I have before said we must have water and land to grow crops, and we can depend on rain. Whatever may be said about God's sending rain on the just and on the unjust, neither the just nor the unjust in this country get as much water as they need. If they asked for it they would get it. They do not get it. They now seek it pursuant to scientific rules.
Assuming for the present, that no prior rights exist to prevent us from appropriating these waters to our use, what benefit is to be derived from our doing it, in whole or in part?
This leads me to the canal, which I am told is to be a little more than twenty-five miles in length, extending from the Jordan to the eastern part of the city, to be of sufficient width and depth to contain a large volume of water. Whether this can be done or not over land that we all know is porous is a question for the engineers. I am not sufficiently well versed in that class of business to enable me to form an opinion. Still, on general principles, we all know, myself among the number, that water in porous land percolates through the soil, and in all lands that the sun sends forth light upon it evaporates. If the canal can be built, and I am told it can, so as to prevent percolation of the water, well, that is a good thing. It will be a good thing, and I know, in sufficient quantities to raise crops; so good may thereby grow out of it. But suppose this to be an error, is there any good to be got of it by irrigation? I am not a farmer, but I am a citizen. I know that the quantity of water which evaporates at any given period from the square foot or square yard of surface, yet it is quite considerable, very likely enough to be a question for the engineers. 10,000,000 solid feet of water may pass into vapor. But where will this vapor go? Scientists tell us that vapor ascends in the air till it reaches an atmosphere of equal heat and pressure, and then, if the air is cool, returns to water and the water returns to the land. Take this statement as correct and apply a little intuition to it and what then? This canal is southeast of the city. The mountains east of it, covered with snow nearly every year till August, will, it appears to me, have a tendency to attract the vapor, cool it off, condense it, and return it in the shape of rain, but this is only auxiliary to the main benefit, yet it is something. The main benefit is to be realized by the inhabitants of the city. Suppose that the money is borrowed and laid out on the canal. This requires a large sum of money. Men who are engaged in business, would not get work and employment, get their pay, the money is paid them, and the city now has the canal, but it is no richer than it was before. It has the canal, but it owes for the canal, and the city is poorer. If the canal can be good the city is neither the richer nor the poorer by the operation. The question now is can the inhabitants of the city get means enough out of the water of the canal to pay themselves for the labor, and pay themselves annually \$30,000, that being the sum to be annually paid for the fifteen years, if so the money is well borrowed, but if not it is getting it here we have injured no person. I will suppose the water here in reasonable quantities, what then? It is known to us that Utah Lake, the natural source of supply, holds in solution vegetable decomposition. It is further known that water running in a warm country is

THE CANAL.
Judge Snow Gives More Facts
and Figures on the
Subject.
SALT LAKE CITY, March 22, 1880.
Editors Herald:
On looking over my remarks in the Herald of the 21st, I discovered I have not, in a few places, made myself as clearly understood as I ought. So I am guilty of leaving undone some things which I ought to have done. In that letter I find the following: "It is not a recognized principle of law, and a recognized right to the use of water may be acquired by appropriation and lost by abandonment." I was speaking in general terms. My mind was on the Utah Lake and the Jordan, the outlet to that lake. The waters of this lake are common property, and no one can have an exclusive right thereto. These waters are common to all. Not that a part may not be appropriated to one and a part to another's use, as the waters come to, lie in and flow from the common fountain. I intended to say that all have a common right to appropriate the water to a reasonable extent for a reasonable purpose, but in its very nature is not so easily segregated as land is, complications necessarily arise.
Again, I find myself to have said near the close of my letter "that right, as far as the town is concerned." I ought to have said "that it then would have read 'so far as this town is concerned.'" There is something in leaving the mind to reflect, or, at least, it appears to me, purposely computed the tax on the taxable property of the city at \$5 per \$1,000, as that would pay the interest. It would raise \$21,000 per annum, which was the interest on \$250,000, at 8 per cent. per annum, and \$1,000 for collecting and disbursing.
In another part of the letter I supposed—stating I did not know—that the revenue of the city might be \$150,000 per annum, and if so, one-tenth of that would be \$15,000. Now this \$30,000 will be a little in excess of \$1 per \$1,000, while \$21,000 will be what I wrote.
The city charter provides many resources for city revenue, among them being a tax on the city property, a little in excess of eleven mills on the dollar. This, if exercised to its fullest extent, will be \$77,000 per annum, though I am told they do not generally exceed five mills. Five mills only amounts to one per cent. on round numbers, \$55,000. The balance of the revenue is from license. The liquor dealers constitute a part. I will make a little computation of this last sum in connection with our present tax law. The property of the taxpayer outside of the city, including territorial, school and county, \$12 on the \$1,000; but with this the city tax on the taxable property in the city of Salt Lake, on the dollar, and it makes \$17 per \$1,000. If we add to this a water tax of \$4 per \$1,000, it will make \$21 on the \$1,000 for territorial, county, school, city and water tax, without increasing the tax to raise the \$50 per annum, no persons taxes will be increased by the borrowing.
Now to the benefit I have before said we must have water and land to grow crops, and we can depend on rain. Whatever may be said about God's sending rain on the just and on the unjust, neither the just nor the unjust in this country get as much water as they need. If they asked for it they would get it. They do not get it. They now seek it pursuant to scientific rules.
Assuming for the present, that no prior rights exist to prevent us from appropriating these waters to our use, what benefit is to be derived from our doing it, in whole or in part?
This leads me to the canal, which I am told is to be a little more than twenty-five miles in length, extending from the Jordan to the eastern part of the city, to be of sufficient width and depth to contain a large volume of water. Whether this can be done or not over land that we all know is porous is a question for the engineers. I am not sufficiently well versed in that class of business to enable me to form an opinion. Still, on general principles, we all know, myself among the number, that water in porous land percolates through the soil, and in all lands that the sun sends forth light upon it evaporates. If the canal can be built, and I am told it can, so as to prevent percolation of the water, well, that is a good thing. It will be a good thing, and I know, in sufficient quantities to raise crops; so good may thereby grow out of it. But suppose this to be an error, is there any good to be got of it by irrigation? I am not a farmer, but I am a citizen. I know that the quantity of water which evaporates at any given period from the square foot or square yard of surface, yet it is quite considerable, very likely enough to be a question for the engineers. 10,000,000 solid feet of water may pass into vapor. But where will this vapor go? Scientists tell us that vapor ascends in the air till it reaches an atmosphere of equal heat and pressure, and then, if the air is cool, returns to water and the water returns to the land. Take this statement as correct and apply a little intuition to it and what then? This canal is southeast of the city. The mountains east of it, covered with snow nearly every year till August, will, it appears to me, have a tendency to attract the vapor, cool it off, condense it, and return it in the shape of rain, but this is only auxiliary to the main benefit, yet it is something. The main benefit is to be realized by the inhabitants of the city. Suppose that the money is borrowed and laid out on the canal. This requires a large sum of money. Men who are engaged in business, would not get work and employment, get their pay, the money is paid them, and the city now has the canal, but it is no richer than it was before. It has the canal, but it owes for the canal, and the city is poorer. If the canal can be good the city is neither the richer nor the poorer by the operation. The question now is can the inhabitants of the city get means enough out of the water of the canal to pay themselves for the labor, and pay themselves annually \$30,000, that being the sum to be annually paid for the fifteen years, if so the money is well borrowed, but if not it is getting it here we have injured no person. I will suppose the water here in reasonable quantities, what then? It is known to us that Utah Lake, the natural source of supply, holds in solution vegetable decomposition. It is further known that water running in a warm country is

THE CANAL.
Judge Snow Gives More Facts
and Figures on the
Subject.
SALT LAKE CITY, March 22, 1880.
Editors Herald:
On looking over my remarks in the Herald of the 21st, I discovered I have not, in a few places, made myself as clearly understood as I ought. So I am guilty of leaving undone some things which I ought to have done. In that letter I find the following: "It is not a recognized principle of law, and a recognized right to the use of water may be acquired by appropriation and lost by abandonment." I was speaking in general terms. My mind was on the Utah Lake and the Jordan, the outlet to that lake. The waters of this lake are common property, and no one can have an exclusive right thereto. These waters are common to all. Not that a part may not be appropriated to one and a part to another's use, as the waters come to, lie in and flow from the common fountain. I intended to say that all have a common right to appropriate the water to a reasonable extent for a reasonable purpose, but in its very nature is not so easily segregated as land is, complications necessarily arise.
Again, I find myself to have said near the close of my letter "that right, as far as the town is concerned." I ought to have said "that it then would have read 'so far as this town is concerned.'" There is something in leaving the mind to reflect, or, at least, it appears to me, purposely computed the tax on the taxable property of the city at \$5 per \$1,000, as that would pay the interest. It would raise \$21,000 per annum, which was the interest on \$250,000, at 8 per cent. per annum, and \$1,000 for collecting and disbursing.
In another part of the letter I supposed—stating I did not know—that the revenue of the city might be \$150,000 per annum, and if so, one-tenth of that would be \$15,000. Now this \$30,000 will be a little in excess of \$1 per \$1,000, while \$21,000 will be what I wrote.
The city charter provides many resources for city revenue, among them being a tax on the city property, a little in excess of eleven mills on the dollar. This, if exercised to its fullest extent, will be \$77,000 per annum, though I am told they do not generally exceed five mills. Five mills only amounts to one per cent. on round numbers, \$55,000. The balance of the revenue is from license. The liquor dealers constitute a part. I will make a little computation of this last sum in connection with our present tax law. The property of the taxpayer outside of the city, including territorial, school and county, \$12 on the \$1,000; but with this the city tax on the taxable property in the city of Salt Lake, on the dollar, and it makes \$17 per \$1,000. If we add to this a water tax of \$4 per \$1,000, it will make \$21 on the \$1,000 for territorial, county, school, city and water tax, without increasing the tax to raise the \$50 per annum, no persons taxes will be increased by the borrowing.
Now to the benefit I have before said we must have water and land to grow crops, and we can depend on rain. Whatever may be said about God's sending rain on the just and on the unjust, neither the just nor the unjust in this country get as much water as they need. If they asked for it they would get it. They do not get it. They now seek it pursuant to scientific rules.
Assuming for the present, that no prior rights exist to prevent us from appropriating these waters to our use, what benefit is to be derived from our doing it, in whole or in part?
This leads me to the canal, which I am told is to be a little more than twenty-five miles in length, extending from the Jordan to the eastern part of the city, to be of sufficient width and depth to contain a large volume of water. Whether this can be done or not over land that we all know is porous is a question for the engineers. I am not sufficiently well versed in that class of business to enable me to form an opinion. Still, on general principles, we all know, myself among the number, that water in porous land percolates through the soil, and in all lands that the sun sends forth light upon it evaporates. If the canal can be built, and I am told it can, so as to prevent percolation of the water, well, that is a good thing. It will be a good thing, and I know, in sufficient quantities to raise crops; so good may thereby grow out of it. But suppose this to be an error, is there any good to be got of it by irrigation? I am not a farmer, but I am a citizen. I know that the quantity of water which evaporates at any given period from the square foot or square yard of surface, yet it is quite considerable, very likely enough to be a question for the engineers. 10,000,000 solid feet of water may pass into vapor. But where will this vapor go? Scientists tell us that vapor ascends in the air till it reaches an atmosphere of equal heat and pressure, and then, if the air is cool, returns to water and the water returns to the land. Take this statement as correct and apply a little intuition to it and what then? This canal is southeast of the city. The mountains east of it, covered with snow nearly every year till August, will, it appears to me, have a tendency to attract the vapor, cool it off, condense it, and return it in the shape of rain, but this is only auxiliary to the main benefit, yet it is something. The main benefit is to be realized by the inhabitants of the city. Suppose that the money is borrowed and laid out on the canal. This requires a large sum of money. Men who are engaged in business, would not get work and employment, get their pay, the money is paid them, and the city now has the canal, but it is no richer than it was before. It has the canal, but it owes for the canal, and the city is poorer. If the canal can be good the city is neither the richer nor the poorer by the operation. The question now is can the inhabitants of the city get means enough out of the water of the canal to pay themselves for the labor, and pay themselves annually \$30,000, that being the sum to be annually paid for the fifteen years, if so the money is well borrowed, but if not it is getting it here we have injured no person. I will suppose the water here in reasonable quantities, what then? It is known to us that Utah Lake, the natural source of supply, holds in solution vegetable decomposition. It is further known that water running in a warm country is

THE CANAL.
Judge Snow Gives More Facts
and Figures on the
Subject.
SALT LAKE CITY, March 22, 1880.
Editors Herald:
On looking over my remarks in the Herald of the 21st, I discovered I have not, in a few places, made myself as clearly understood as I ought. So I am guilty of leaving undone some things which I ought to have done. In that letter I find the following: "It is not a recognized principle of law, and a recognized right to the use of water may be acquired by appropriation and lost by abandonment." I was speaking in general terms. My mind was on the Utah Lake and the Jordan, the outlet to that lake. The waters of this lake are common property, and no one can have an exclusive right thereto. These waters are common to all. Not that a part may not be appropriated to one and a part to another's use, as the waters come to, lie in and flow from the common fountain. I intended to say that all have a common right to appropriate the water to a reasonable extent for a reasonable purpose, but in its very nature is not so easily segregated as land is, complications necessarily arise.
Again, I find myself to have said near the close of my letter "that right, as far as the town is concerned." I ought to have said "that it then would have read 'so far as this town is concerned.'" There is something in leaving the mind to reflect, or, at least, it appears to me, purposely computed the tax on the taxable property of the city at \$5 per \$1,000, as that would pay the interest. It would raise \$21,000 per annum, which was the interest on \$250,000, at 8 per cent. per annum, and \$1,000 for collecting and disbursing.
In another part of the letter I supposed—stating I did not know—that the revenue of the city might be \$150,000 per annum, and if so, one-tenth of that would be \$15,000. Now this \$30,000 will be a little in excess of \$1 per \$1,000, while \$21,000 will be what I wrote.
The city charter provides many resources for city revenue, among them being a tax on the city property, a little in excess of eleven mills on the dollar. This, if exercised to its fullest extent, will be \$77,000 per annum, though I am told they do not generally exceed five mills. Five mills only amounts to one per cent. on round numbers, \$55,000. The balance of the revenue is from license. The liquor dealers constitute a part. I will make a little computation of this last sum in connection with our present tax law. The property of the taxpayer outside of the city, including territorial, school and county, \$12 on the \$1,000; but with this the city tax on the taxable property in the city of Salt Lake, on the dollar, and it makes \$17 per \$1,000. If we add to this a water tax of \$4 per \$1,000, it will make \$21 on the \$1,000 for territorial, county, school, city and water tax, without increasing the tax to raise the \$50 per annum, no persons taxes will be increased by the borrowing.
Now to the benefit I have before said we must have water and land to grow crops, and we can depend on rain. Whatever may be said about God's sending rain on the just and on the unjust, neither the just nor the unjust in this country get as much water as they need. If they asked for it they would get it. They do not get it. They now seek it pursuant to scientific rules.
Assuming for the present, that no prior rights exist to prevent us from appropriating these waters to our use, what benefit is to be derived from our doing it, in whole or in part?
This leads me to the canal, which I am told is to be a little more than twenty-five miles in length, extending from the Jordan to the eastern part of the city, to be of sufficient width and depth to contain a large volume of water. Whether this can be done or not over land that we all know is porous is a question for the engineers. I am not sufficiently well versed in that class of business to enable me to form an opinion. Still, on general principles, we all know, myself among the number, that water in porous land percolates through the soil, and in all lands that the sun sends forth light upon it evaporates. If the canal can be built, and I am told it can, so as to prevent percolation of the water, well, that is a good thing. It will be a good thing, and I know, in sufficient quantities to raise crops; so good may thereby grow out of it. But suppose this to be an error, is there any good to be got of it by irrigation? I am not a farmer, but I am a citizen. I know that the quantity of water which evaporates at any given period from the square foot or square yard of surface, yet it is quite considerable, very likely enough to be a question for the engineers. 10,000,000 solid feet of water may pass into vapor. But where will this vapor go? Scientists tell us that vapor ascends in the air till it reaches an atmosphere of equal heat and pressure, and then, if the air is cool, returns to water and the water returns to the land. Take this statement as correct and apply a little intuition to it and what then? This canal is southeast of the city. The mountains east of it, covered with snow nearly every year till August, will, it appears to me, have a tendency to attract the vapor, cool it off, condense it, and return it in the shape of rain, but this is only auxiliary to the main benefit, yet it is something. The main benefit is to be realized by the inhabitants of the city. Suppose that the money is borrowed and laid out on the canal. This requires a large sum of money. Men who are engaged in business, would not get work and employment, get their pay, the money is paid them, and the city now has the canal, but it is no richer than it was before. It has the canal, but it owes for the canal, and the city is poorer. If the canal can be good the city is neither the richer nor the poorer by the operation. The question now is can the inhabitants of the city get means enough out of the water of the canal to pay themselves for the labor, and pay themselves annually \$30,000, that being the sum to be annually paid for the fifteen years, if so the money is well borrowed, but if not it is getting it here we have injured no person. I will suppose the water here in reasonable quantities, what then? It is known to us that Utah Lake, the natural source of supply, holds in solution vegetable decomposition. It is further known that water running in a warm country is

THE CANAL.
Judge Snow Gives More Facts
and Figures on the
Subject.
SALT LAKE CITY, March 22, 1880.
Editors Herald:
On looking over my remarks in the Herald of the 21st, I discovered I have not, in a few places, made myself as clearly understood as I ought. So I am guilty of leaving undone some things which I ought to have done. In that letter I find the following: "It is not a recognized principle of law, and a recognized right to the use of water may be acquired by appropriation and lost by abandonment." I was speaking in general terms. My mind was on the Utah Lake and the Jordan, the outlet to that lake. The waters of this lake are common property, and no one can have an exclusive right thereto. These waters are common to all. Not that a part may not be appropriated to one and a part to another's use, as the waters come to, lie in and flow from the common fountain. I intended to say that all have a common right to appropriate the water to a reasonable extent for a reasonable purpose, but in its very nature is not so easily segregated as land is, complications necessarily arise.
Again, I find myself to have said near the close of my letter "that right, as far as the town is concerned." I ought to have said "that it then would have read 'so far as this town is concerned.'" There is something in leaving the mind to reflect, or, at least, it appears to me, purposely computed the tax on the taxable property of the city at \$5 per \$1,000, as that would pay the interest. It would raise \$21,000 per annum, which was the interest on \$250,000, at 8 per cent. per annum, and \$1,000 for collecting and disbursing.
In another part of the letter I supposed—stating I did not know—that the revenue of the city might be \$150,000 per annum, and if so, one-tenth of that would be \$15,000. Now this \$30,000 will be a little in excess of \$1 per \$1,000, while \$21,000 will be what I wrote.
The city charter provides many resources for city revenue, among them being a tax on the city property, a little in excess of eleven mills on the dollar. This, if exercised to its fullest extent, will be \$77,000 per annum, though I am told they do not generally exceed five mills. Five mills only amounts to one per cent. on round numbers, \$55,000. The balance of the revenue is from license. The liquor dealers constitute a part. I will make a little computation of this last sum in connection with our present tax law. The property of the taxpayer outside of the city, including territorial, school and county, \$12 on the \$1,000; but with this the city tax on the taxable property in the city of Salt Lake, on the dollar, and it makes \$17 per \$1,000. If we add to this a water tax of \$4 per \$1,000, it will make \$21 on the \$1,000 for territorial, county, school, city and water tax, without increasing the tax to raise the \$50 per annum, no persons taxes will be increased by the borrowing.
Now to the benefit I have before said we must have water and land to grow crops, and we can depend on rain. Whatever may be said about God's sending rain on the just and on the unjust, neither the just nor the unjust in this country get as much water as they need. If they asked for it they would get it. They do not get it. They now seek it pursuant to scientific rules.
Assuming for the present, that no prior rights exist to prevent us from appropriating these waters to our use, what benefit is to be derived from our doing it, in whole or in part?
This leads me to the canal, which I am told is to be a little more than twenty-five miles in length, extending from the Jordan to the eastern part of the city, to be of sufficient width and depth to contain a large volume of water. Whether this can be done or not over land that we all know is porous is a question for the engineers. I am not sufficiently well versed in that class of business to enable me to form an opinion. Still, on general principles, we all know, myself among the number, that water in porous land percolates through the soil, and in all lands that the sun sends forth light upon it evaporates. If the canal can be built, and I am told it can, so as to prevent percolation of the water, well, that is a good thing. It will be a good thing, and I know, in sufficient quantities to raise crops; so good may thereby grow out of it. But suppose this to be an error, is there any good to